



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

September 11, 2003

Mr. Miles K. Risley  
Senior Assistant City Attorney  
City of Victoria  
P.O. Box 1758  
Victoria, Texas 77902-1758

OR2003-6386

Dear Mr. Risley:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 187479.

The City of Victoria Police Department (the "department") received a request for "all photographs in Case No. 9922488." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code and under federal law. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the department has failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. Although you submitted a copy of the "photograph, audio and video tape purchase request," you have not submitted to this office a copy of the actual written request for information.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to submit to this office the information required in section 552.301(e) results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd.*

*of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). In this instance, you claim that the submitted information is excepted by sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code and by federal law. Sections 552.103 and 552.108 are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived by the governmental body.<sup>1</sup> However, the need of another governmental body to withhold information under section 552.108 can provide a compelling reason under section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision No. 586 at 3 (1991). In this instance, we have received correspondence from the United States Department of Justice ("DOJ") stating that the requested information relates to a pending prosecution and asking that the information at issue be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1). Therefore, we will consider your section 552.108 argument and your claim under federal law.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. You ask whether any of the submitted information is protected under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"). At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("HHS") promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164; *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

Section 160.103 defines a covered entity as a health plan, a health clearinghouse, or a healthcare provider who transmits any health information in electronic form in connection with a transaction covered by this subchapter. 45 C.F.R. § 160.103. In this instance, you do not assert or explain that the department qualifies as a covered entity under HIPAA.

---

<sup>1</sup>Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 551 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential), 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103).

Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that any of the submitted information warrants protection under the federal act, and no information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” A governmental body that raises section 552.108 must reasonably explain, if the requested information does not supply an explanation on its face, how and why section 552.108 is applicable to the information. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986). When an incident is still under active investigation or prosecution, section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information relating to the incident. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 at 4-5 (1987), 372 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991).

Based on our review of the submitted information and the representations of the DOJ, we conclude that the release of the submitted information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). You may withhold the submitted photographs under section 552.108(a)(1).

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the

governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Jennifer E. Berry  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JEB/sdk

Ref: ID# 187479

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rodney Miles  
Law Offices of David W. Showalter  
5231 Bellaire Boulevard  
Houston, Texas 77401  
(w/o enclosures)